

VZCZCXRO1596  
OO RUEHTRO  
DE RUEHFR #3027 1940901  
ZNY CCCCC ZZH  
O 130901Z JUL 07  
FM AMEMBASSY PARIS  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8931  
INFO RUEHRL/AMEMBASSY BERLIN PRIORITY 6634  
RUEHLO/AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY 6618  
RUEHRO/AMEMBASSY ROME PRIORITY 8471  
RUEHTC/AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE PRIORITY 2823  
RUEHTRO/AMEMBASSY TRIPOLI PRIORITY 0093

C O N F I D E N T I A L PARIS 003027

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: DECL: 07/12/2017  
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#) [GM](#) [IT](#) [LY](#) [FR](#)  
SUBJECT: FRANCE SHARES U.S. CONCERNS ON LIBYAN CW  
DESTRUCTION

REF: STATE 94204

Classified By: Acting Political Counselor Bruce Turner for reasons 1.4  
b and d.

¶1. (C) SUMMARY: On July 10, we delivered reftel demarche to MFA desk officers for CW issues Olivier Sigaud and Minh-di Tang. Sigaud related that the GOF understood that, as of late 2006, Libya was considering the U.S. and French proposals. He commented that the U.S. proposal was expensive, but partially financed, while the French one focused on technical assistance and did not comprise any funding. According to Sigaud, France had concluded in 2006 that Libya had already decided against the Italian and German proposals (reftel), and seemed to be playing the French and U.S. proposals off each other, trying to get the best deal. At a Quad meeting in Paris in early 2007, according to Sigaud, France had told the U.S. the Libyans were playing a complicated game, and that we needed to coordinate more closely to ensure that our shared priority - timely destruction of Libyan CW stockpiles - was met.

¶2. (C) In the way of additional background, Sigaud noted that the French had been surprised in 2006 to learn about the government-to-government contract between the U.S. and Libya. They had been further surprised in The Hague by Libya's subsequent announcement that it had dropped the U.S. contract for the destruction of its stock of chemical weapons in favor of a European company. He observed that "a priori" the firm in question could not be French. Meanwhile, the Germans were saying it was not German, while the Italians were not sure whether it could be Italian, he said.

¶3. (C) Sigaud expressed a low level of confidence in the Libyan authorities and questioned whether a contract exists. Sigaud noted that if there is no contract, he is worried that Libya may not intend to follow through with the destruction of its chemical weapons. Given the low level of security at their storage site, the situation is already worrisome, he added.

¶4. (C) Sigaud reaffirmed French support for our common goals and advised that France is also seeking information on Libyan intentions in Tripoli and other capitals, including Rome and Berlin. Stressing the importance of information exchange, he said that France would share any useful results with the U.S., and asked us to do the same. Sigaud, alluding again to the 2006 U.S.-Libyan contract, appealed for continued and formal contacts on this issue, including through ongoing CW demarches.

¶5. (U) MINIMIZE FOR TRIPOLI CONSIDERED.

Please visit Paris' Classified Website at:

<http://www.state.sgov.gov/p/eur/paris/index.cfm>

STAPLETON